REMARKS

Claims 1 – 30 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12-30 are withdrawn due to a restriction requirement. Applicants herein add new claims 31-34 to more clearly set forth the invention, and have cancelled claims 8-11 without prejudice. Claim 1 is the only claim in independent form. The specification has been amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7 are objected to for the informality of containing subject matter drawn to the nonelected invention of monoclonal antibodies. In response thereto, the claims have been amended to make it clear that the invention relates to the use of both purified and unpurifed immunoglobulins in a microarray, regardless of their monoclonal or polyclonal nature.

Claims 1-7 are objected to for the informality of the language "fluids unprocessed for immunoglobulin isolation". In response thereto, the claims have been amended to include alternative language suggested in the Office Action, "fluids that are unprocessed for immunoglobulin isolation".

Claims 1-7 are objected to for the informality of the phrase "polyclonal antibodies that are purified immunoglobulins….said purified immunoblobulin proteins". Similar language is objected to in Claims 8-12. In response thereto, the objection has been mooted by the elimination of language from the claims.

In view of these corrections of informalities, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected as indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action

holds that it is not clear whether the claims are drawn to a product, or a method of screening or making. In response thereto, all claims have been amended to make it clear that methods of screening are claimed.

Claims 1-11 also stand rejected as indefinite on the grounds that a nexus is missing between the preamble and the last line of the claim. In response thereto, all claims have been amended to provide such a nexus.

Claims 1-11 also stand rejected as indefinite on the grounds of a lack of positive steps. In response thereto, all claims have been amended to provide positive steps.

Claims 1-11 also stand rejected as incomplete for omitting essential steps, namely the steps of determining which unprocessed fluids or antisera have higher amounts. The Office Action also inquires as to whether this determination renders the fluids processed. In response thereto, the steps of comparing unprocessed fluids and purified immunoglobulins to determine optimal concentrations are now described in new claim 31 and 32. It is now clear from the amended claim language that there are no steps which alter the processed or purified nature of the fluids being compared. Support for the steps of new claim 31 is found in the specification at page 11 line 19 to page 12 line 15.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected as indefinite on the grounds that it is unclear whether unprocessed fluids and polyclonal antibodies are spotted onto the same positions or different positions. In response thereto, the relevant limitation of the invention is now encompassed by new claim 31, wherein it is made clear that unprocessed fluids and purified antibodies are spotted onto different sets of locations on a substrate.

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected as indefinite on the grounds that independent claim 1 is drawn to a method for a microarray screen but that dependent claims 6 and 11 are drawn to a method of optimizing spotting concentrations of IgG. In response thereto, amended claim 6 now makes it clear that the optimizing of spotting concentrations is a subordinate step of the screening method encompassed by claim 1.

Applicant further notes that the limitation of new claim 34, "spotting fluids that are unprocessed for immunoglobulin isolation at a 10 – 1000 fold dilution" is supported in the specification by the following chain of facts. Purified immunoglobulins were spotted at protein concentrations of 0, 0.5, 5, 50, and 500 µg/ml (page 11, line 5). Signal levels for unpurified immunoglobulins, when diluted 10 fold, were similar to those obtained with purified immunoglobulins at 500 µg/ml (page 11, lines 23-34 and page 12, lines 1-3), and signal levels for unpurified immunoglobulins, when diluted 10 fold, were similar to those obtained with purified immunoglobulins at 50 µg/ml (page 12 lines 1-3). The invention successfully detected signals when purified immunoglobulins were used at 5.0 µg/ml (e.g. Table 2); That concentration corresponds to a 1000 fold dilution of unpurified immunoglobulins, and therefore the specification discloses that unpurified immunoglobulins can be used with the invention at a 1000 fold dilution of unpurified immunoglobulins.

In view of the present amendment and foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and advancement of the case to issue are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee or credit any overpayment in connection with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 11-1449.

Respectfully submitted,

KOHN & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

/Kenneth I. Kohn/
Kenneth I. Kohn, Reg. No. 30,955
Customer No.: 48924

Dated: December 22, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING VIA EFS-WEB

Date of Electronic Filing: December 22, 2009

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with the United States Patent & Trademark Office on the above date.

/Natalie Zemgulis/
Natalie Zemgulis